gHist
P

THE PATRIOT

No. 2.—Vol. I. 16 FEBRUARY, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.

***INTRODUCTION.**—THE PATRIOT has been started for a trial period of three months, from 9 Feb., 1922, for the purpose of supplying briefly, striking facts and arguments relating to movements threatening the safety and welfare of the British Empire; movements, the dangers of which are either concealed or made light of in the majority of the newspapers. The public generally have been kept in ignorance for several years, through what appears to be a concerted policy between a section of the Government and an influential portion of the Press, both swayed by alien influences hostile to the Nation. There is no intention of producing the ordinary news of the established newspapers; but it is proposed simply to publish details omitted by nearly all of them, and yet of vital importance to the proper understanding of movements and tendencies below the surface of events. The paper started with a circulation secured in advance: and its continuance will depend on merit and on the extent of its future support.*

Large orders for THE PATRIOT at reduced price on application to the Publishers, The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE INDIAN DANGER.

II.—(*Concluded*).

By **LORD SYDENHAM.**

In a few years Mr. Montagu, with the authority vested in him by the Coalition Government, has undone the work of a century, which has cost the lives of tens of thousands of Britons. Such has been the achievement of the first Jewish Secretary of State for India! His policy—disastrously consistent from the beginning—was inspired by two ruling principles: (1) To set up a purely Western democracy in a country which may or may not become suited for Parliamentary institutions in a hundred years; and (2) to buy off opposition and to seek peace in his time by successive concessions to the avowed enemies of Britain. He pursued his headlong course regardless of all warnings, fortified by the advice of Mrs. Besant and a few renegade officials who knew better, and intimidated by the organised clamour of a small minority of Indians craving for power. His policy involved the cynical abandonment of tens of millions of helpless illiterates, who under British rule had found, for the first time, even-handed justice and protection from the immemorial oppression of their upper classes wherever the supervision of the British official extended. For the masses, not for the classes, the British Government and Parliament were responsible until Mr. Montagu supervened.

The story of the great betrayal will be told in detail some day, and the historian will trace distinct stages in the rapid *descensus Averni*. The handling of the Punjab rebellion in March and April, 1919, by the Secretary of State and his tool, the Government of India, was the first public announcement that officials, British and Indian, and loyal Indians could no longer count upon support. This rebellion—the third effort in the Punjab—was the result of a far-ranging plan better conceived than the Mutiny. It was to coincide with an Afghan invasion; the native regiments were to be seduced, and the railways to be cut at carefully selected points. The evidence of all this was complete; but the British public was not allowed to know it. The Afghans did not come up to time, and a great part of Northern India was saved barely by the firm action of the Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab, with a total loss of 400 lives. An inquiry immediately after the event would have brought out the gratitude of the people of Amritsar to General Dyer, who saved their lives and property. Mr. Montagu, however, held his inquiry months later, and included in his Committee an Indian who had publicly libelled Sir M. O'Dwyer. The Chairman, knowing nothing of India, was totally unfitted for his task. The intimidation of witnesses had been rampant and successful. The cross-examination of General Dyer and others by the Indian members of the Committee, who constituted themselves counsel for the prosecution, was grossly unfair, and as the Committee did not take essential evidence, its report was inaccurate and unjust. The Coalition Government proceeded to deliver judgment after a violent propaganda embodying shameful falsehoods had been carried on here and in India. The careers of some officials of the Punjab, including General Dyer, were ruined, and Indian witnesses who spoke the truth have been victimised ever since.

The effect in India was twofold. The pack to whom Mr. Montagu threw his subordinates became more fierce, and is still demanding blood. British

residents and Indian friends of the Raj learned that the Government would not protect them, and as the officers of the Army were taught that it was dangerous to use their judgment in an emergency, there have been incidents involving loss of life on an unnecessary scale. Henceforth it became clear that Mr. Montagu would concede anything to clamour, and the revolutionary leaders gathered strength and perfected their organisation. Mr. Gandhi, the prime mover in the Punjab rebellion, gained an immense accession of power and prestige, while the immunity he has enjoyed caused him to be invested with supernatural qualities.

Onwards from 1919 the progress towards anarchy quickened, and the visit of the Prince of Wales, which the Government must have sanctioned on the advice of Mr. Montagu and Lord Reading, was naturally taken up as a challenge by all the disloyal elements throughout India. The experiences of the tour provide some measure of the depth and extent of the race-hatred and contempt which the revolutionary organisations have been permitted to arouse. In the great native States, whose rulers have shown a firm front against agitation, the Prince received the whole-hearted welcome characteristic of Indians who had not been tampered with.

Frightened by what he saw in Bombay, the Viceroy began to take action too late. The gaols are now full of dupes, some of them driven by intimidation. They cannot all be tried, and if released they will attribute their freedom to the power of Gandhi. Meanwhile, the toll of lives steadily mounts, and as the agitators take no risks, the victims are humble persons who a few years ago were harmless and contented.

Briefly, the situation, which the British public is only beginning to understand, is this: The great public services, which made India the marvel of the Eastern world, are disheartened and tending to disintegration. Our Indian supporters distrust the Government, which has failed to protect them and shown tenderness to criminals. Imported Bolshevism has appeared in strikes and sabotage. The financial position is desperate, owing partly to the mischievous interference of the Government with exchange, and partly to the exorbitant cost of Mr. Montagu's constitution. Some of the new Councils—notably that of Bengal—are attacking the foundations of order, and all have received powers enabling them to bring government to a standstill. The marvellous work of our forefathers is crumbling to pieces, and the helpless, ignorant masses, who should have been our first care, will be the chief sufferers. Such are the inevitable achievements of a Government in the East which shows fear.

The situation which the Coalition, by the agency of Mr. Montagu, has brought about is tersely summed up by a loyal Indian of the Punjab writing to me last month: "In fact, the Government and its officers have little prestige left, and God knows what we are coming to."

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM.

By ERNEST E. WILLIAMS.

Occasionally one hears it said—very frequently insinuated—that Our Lord taught Socialism. There is not a word of such teaching in Our Lord's recorded sayings, from the beginning to the end of the Gospels. His choosing to be born in the working-class was but an additional sign of the humility which made God man at all. His counsel of perfection to a man with a special vocation, "Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor," was a recognition of the normality of property. His warning of the special difficulty encompassing a rich man's entry into heaven was no more a condemnation of wealth than would have been a warning of the difficulty of a beautiful woman keeping from temptation a condemnation of beauty. His injunction to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's was at once a recognition of the lawfulness of State authority and of its limitations. Neither isolated text nor the general trend of His teaching lends support to the socialistic theory. The plain effect of His teaching is in a contrary direction: it is summed up in the words, "My kingdom is not of this world." He was not teaching politics or economics.

Socialism in the time of Our Lord's life on earth was an unknown idea. Therefore it cannot be assumed that He was implicitly accepting and teaching Socialism. Had He wished to teach it, He would have had to bring forward and explain its principles very explicitly, or His hearers would not have understood Him, so foreign was the conception to the ideas of that day. Clearly He never did that. There is, of course, the possibility that, without teaching formally a doctrine for which His hearers were not ready, Our Lord may have sown seed intended to develop into socialistic doctrine in due time. But where is the evidence of such seed? Is there a solitary recorded saying which can be interpreted as a seed doctrine of Socialism? Think what Socialism is. It is the doctrine of common or State ownership of everything except the most immediate articles of personal use. It is safe to affirm that not a single saying of Christ can be quoted as indicating a wish or intention to promote that idea.

There remains another question. Though Our Lord neither directly nor indirectly taught Socialism, may it not be that Socialism is consonant with His teaching, or, put at the lowest, is not antagonistic to Christianity? This question is a little, but, I think, not much more difficult to answer.

Christ came to spread religion among men. What is religion? It is not a code of morality; it is not an affair of benevolent social activities; it is not membership of a church. It includes these things; but it is not them. It is communion with God, the conscious union of a man's will with God's will, prompted by love, fortified by prayer. Such religion does not require a perfect, or even a decent, social system for its development. It can be practised under almost any conditions of life, though some conditions are more favourable than others. But with regard particularly to economic conditions, upon which the Christian Socialist type of mind is so much exercised, it needs to be pointed out that the influence of external conditions is easily exaggerated. It is assumed too readily that religion is an impossibility in the slums; poverty, not excepting extreme poverty, is a help as well as a hindrance. The worst effect of grinding poverty on religion is not upon the victims of the poverty, but upon those wealthier members of the community who see their brothers in want, and pass by with callous indifference.

However, while guarding against the tendency to exaggerate the influence of external conditions upon religion, attention should be given to one important, almost vital, condition—and that is freedom. In various directions freedom is a necessary or a desirable condition for the development of religion. For the moment let us regard one direction, because it bears closely upon the question we are trying to solve. Christ's Church must be free.

Though, as I have said, religion is different from, and larger than, the Church, yet the Church is the guardian of religion, and is of vital moment to religion. The Church is a society founded by Our Lord; in a mystical way it is something more than that: it is a very part of Christ Himself, an extension of His Personality. It is a kingdom, on earth, but not of the earth. It works on earth, and its members are men living on the earth in ordinary human conditions. Its business is to save men's souls, to impose a rule of life upon them It cannot do all this properly unless it is free. Could it be free under Socialism?

Picture the Socialist State. Every inch of land, and all that is built upon it, the property of a governmental bureaucracy (for it must be that: the phrases about "communal" and "social" ownership, applied in practice to a civilised State, are idle chatter)—all the means of wealth production in the hands of the same governmental bureaucracy, with the inevitable corollary of bureaucratic despotism over every man and woman in the community. Where would the freedom of the Church be? She would hold her churches on the suffrage of politicians in power, who could at any moment threaten eviction for teaching obnoxious doctrines; could convert those buildings into cinema palaces at their will. The Church would be powerless to determine who should constitute her priesthood and fill her offices, for every man would be dependent on the State for his daily bread, and the State's bureaucrats would decide what each man's employment should be. For all that she wanted in the way of material adjuncts —every bell, book, and candle—she would have to go cap in hand to the State, the sole dispenser of wealth. And in her teaching, her education, her methods of administering the Sacraments, she would be absolutely under the dominion of State officials. Imagine the Established Church of England, without any property of her own, and with all her members equally without means beyond the pittance granted to them to satisfy their own daily wants, and apportioned on that basis—members who, consequently, would be unable to maintain the Church by voluntary contributions. And imagine in those circumstances a Legislature which disapproved the Church's "effete" system of morals. Would the Church have any option between extinction and the teaching of the desired paganism?

Or take the case of the French Church in the bad, pre-war days of anti-clerical persecution, when religious orders were suppressed and banished, and the Church's wealth confiscated with the abolition of the Concordat. The Church survived because the individualist institution of private property remained, after the spoliation had been accomplished. But suppose a fully fledged Socialist Republic had been in being, the Church would not have had a shred of property to fall back upon, and the faithful would have had no means of supporting her by alms.

The prospect of the Church under Socialism is appalling. At the best it would be bound servilely to the State; and whenever the State comprised a hostile majority—and the Church and the world will always, save for happy intervals, be more or less in conflict—nay, whenever the State power got into the hands of an active, hostile minority—the very existence of the Church would be imperilled. Persecution the Church can endure: but a social system under which the Church and its officers and members could hold no property, and so would be without the material means of subsistence, not even the Church could endure.

WHAT IS THE LABOUR PARTY?

HOW IS IT COMPOSED AND CONTROLLED?

By DAVID GILMOUR, O.B.E.

(*Reprinted from "The Empire Citizen."*)

What is the Labour Party? What is the character of its organisation? Where do the funds come from? And how are they spent?

The Labour Party as such has no direct and immediate contact with the workers. Delegates from the following units make up the conferences of the Labour Party, the final Court in which policies are resolved and marching orders given to the Parliamentary group. The units comprising the Labour Party are as follow:—

1. Trades Unions.
2. Trades Councils and local Labour Parties.
3. Independent Labour Party.
4. Social Democratic Federation.
5. The Jewish Socialist Party.
6. The Herald League.
7. The Fabian Society.

The membership paid for by the Socialist bodies is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
The Independent Labour Party, 35,000 members with dues paid	437	10	0
The Social Democratic Federation, 2,000 members with dues paid	16	13	4
The Jewish Socialist Party, 3,000 members with dues paid	37	10	0
The Fabian Society, 1,770 members with dues paid	22	2	6
The Herald League, 500 members with dues paid	6	5	0
Total	£520	0	10

It will thus be seen that the total income drawn from the affiliated societies, apart from members of the Unions, amounts to only £520 0s. 10d.

Affiliation fees from Trades Councils and local Labour Parties approximate £800, making a total of a little over £1,300 from all the auxiliary bodies put together, or roughly 1/35th part of the total income of the National Labour Party.

The affiliation fees paid by the Trades Unions roughly approximated last year to £46,000.

Payments from the Trades Unions, therefore, stand as 34 to 1 against all the other sections put together. The dues are fixed at 3d. per member per year.

How is the Money Spent.

The principal items of expenditure are as follow:—

	£	s.	d.
Office expenses	15,000	0	0
Organisation expenses	4,700	0	0
Grants to local Labour Parties (being part payment of agents' salaries)	4,000	0	0
Executive Committee Meetings	1,300	0	0
Literature	3,200	0	0
Conferences	3,000	0	0
International Delegations, about	4,000	0	0
Grant for Propaganda *re* Nationalisation of Mines	1,000	0	0

Although there are seven sections connected with the Labour Party Conferences, the members included in each section may be in any or all of the sections.

Duplication of Membership.

The principle of duplication has become a very fine art. Disgruntled members of Trades Unions who find themselves unable to get into official positions through the Unions join, in many cases, one or more of the other sections in order to have a double or treble opportunity of getting selected.

Who Get the Plums of Office?

The Socialist members almost invariably succeed in getting into the most lucrative positions as organisers, etc. A scrutiny of the list of Agents proves this conclusively, and since the rules are altered to admit individuals to membership of the local Labour Councils, the door has been opened wide for a new section of so-called Labour representatives. Brigadier-Generals, Commanders in the Navy, lawyers, and other professional politicians have wormed their way in through the widening of the door for admission.

Representation at Conferences.

The last Annual Conference Delegation was constituted as follows: Trades Union Delegates, 611: other sections, 261; showing that, while the sections outside the Trades Unions only contributed about 1/35th part of the income, they had almost one-half of the delegation, and in the sittings of the Congress more than three-quarters of the whole time was taken up by delegates who might be looked upon as irresponsible.

Where Does the Rank and File Come In?

They do not come into the picture at all. It is a well-known fact that the Agendas which are dealt with at the Conferences never reach the rank and file of the members of the Unions, and therefore the policy enunciated is entirely the view of the individual irresponsible delegates.

Labour Party Policy.

Should the Labour Party succeed in getting into power, they will be faced with a very awkward situation. It is the easiest thing in the world to get resolutions of the most far-reaching character carried through at a Conference. For instance, a Resolution declaring the policy of the Nationalisation of the Means of Production, Distribution, and Exchange has been carried year after year, not only in the Annual Conferences of the Labour Party, but also at the Conferences of the British Trades Unions' Congress. One outstanding line of policy which has been carried in connection with unemployment is that the Government must either find work or pay full wages until work is available. If this situation has ever to be faced by a Labour Government, trouble will arise.

Election Expenses.

The Labour Party does not attempt to meet election expenses of candidates. Where officials of Trades Unions are selected, the Trades Unions meet the expenses, but very often the Socialist sections of the Party nominate individuals holding extremist views. When this is done, the Local or Divisional Councils have to obtain funds to meet the expenses, and this section is finding it more and more difficult to raise finance. As a result, individuals of the Brigadier-General type, discarded Liberals and others possessing wealth are often selected because of their ability to meet their own expenses.

Election Expenses of Trades Union Candidates.

The expenses of running a Trades Union candidate generally work out at a rate a long way higher than some of the other sections, and it may be put quite fairly that the average expense in contesting an election will amount to over £1,000; indeed, I remember a case of one of the miners' candidates which was discussed very freely, in which the expenses amounted to no less a sum than £2,200. The Miners' Federation has raised the Parliamentary levy to a sum of 2s. per head per year, which, on a membership of 900,000, works out at £90,000. Part of this money is refunded to the sections to meet expenses in contesting seats on local authorities. Delegate Conferences of the Miners' Federation deal generously with the members.

Miners' M.P.'s Remuneration.

In addition to the £400 of Parliamentary salary, a grant is made from the Union funds of an additional £350 plus first-class railway pass. In addition to that amount, it is now becoming customary to pay a retaining fee from the Union funds, and as a matter of fact, in some cases the full salary of the member for his Trades Union work is still continued, and so there are not a few sitting Members of Parliament in receipt one way and another of salaries ranging up to and beyond £1,000 a year. The rank and file of the men have never been consulted in regard to this heavy expenditure.

Ruinous Expenses.

Trades Union expenditure has bulked very largely in the Press recently, and if the movement develops politically, the contributions paid by the men for the proper protection of their labour interests will be almost entirely used up in other ways than was originally anticipated. Payments for local services inside the Trades Unions have risen to an alarming extent, expenses being such that not for many years will it be possible to raise anything in the nature of a fighting fund to protect wages. A Trade Union which saves an average of £1 a year per member for the reserve funds is looked upon as very fortunate. A saving of £5 per member in five years would all be wiped out by a four or five weeks' strike. Individual members of the Union are now beginning to realise the impossibility of building up reserve funds on any large scale, and thus it is that many hundreds of thousands of the men have discontinued paying subscriptions.

Political Expenditure.

It is very well known that if the men had the absolute choice as to paying voluntarily into a political fund, less than 10 per cent. would contribute.

The maintenance of the Party is a direct fine upon the great body of the workers, who by a careful process of manipulation are excluded from its control, and who by an equally clever piece of intriguing are made responsible for its policy. It is almost exclusively a Socialist venture run on Trades Union money.

Is Mr. Arthur Henderson's Boast Justified?

Mr. Arthur Henderson boasts that the Labour Party has decided to contest over 400 seats at the forthcoming General Election. Thus will another £400,000 of the workers' Trades Union contributions go into the melting-pot.

If the long-suffering members of Trades Unions do not put a stop to the squandering of their hard-earned money by political intriguers, the destruction of the Unions is inevitable.

The Remedy.

The remedy is to put payment for politics on a voluntary basis, and thus get rid of a set of revolutionary schemers who calculate on having a good time as Commissaries under a Bolshevik régime when the workers would become *Labour Conscripts.*

NOTES.

"Disloyalty

The troubles of the country since the Armistice are largely due to the same people who abused or hindered us in war. An example will explain, and hundreds could be given. Mr. Bernard Shaw, soon after we were at war, wrote, to instruct the world, on Englishmen as "sniffling hypocritically about our love of peace and our respect for treaties, and our solemn acceptance of a painful duty, and all the rest of the nauseous mixture of schoolmaster's cant and cinematograph melodrama with which we are deluged—all the rest of the slosh and tosh which has been making John Bull sick for months past." During the great railway strike of September, 1919, G.B.S. was President of the *Labour Research Department*, and directed the spending of £1,500 daily in influencing the Press and misleading the public on what was correctly described by the Prime Minister as "the outcome of an Anarchist plot," and was one of the manipulated series of strikes to coerce the nation, ending in the great coal strike of 1921. That continued conspiracy was the actual cause of much of the unemployment of to-day by the deliberate destruction of industry. It would be really good for the country if politicians and newspaper editors could be made to read the book "Disloyalty," by Harold Owen.

The Ink Age.

The course of man on the earth has been divided into ages, such as the Stone Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age; and the present one may well be known hereafter as the Ink Age. Facilities for printing and distribution have so greatly increased that the whole world is smudged with ink. People who have to keep up with current issues are getting overwhelmed with reading matter. Newspapers have not improved with their growth in size and number, and their multitude and variety have made the getting at plain facts and home truths more difficult instead of less so. The ubiquity of the printed word has been accompanied by a dangerous devotion to phrases which appear to carry noble aims yet can be twisted to suit political inclinations.

Honours too Easy.

It is a misfortune for the country that honours seem less than ever a matter of pure merit or national service. The recurring lists bring back to mind the lines current in the City when the famous company promoter, Mr. Grant, was favoured with the foreign title of Baron Grant.

> Kings can give titles: honour, they can't;
> Title, without honour, is a barren grant.

It is an undoubted fact that some very undeserving people have been honoured of late years; and it may be added that, in view of the way the general public have been misled by the Press in the last six years on subjects vital to the safety of the Empire, too many bouquets have been thrown by the Government to journalism in general.

Irish Political Genius.

The American lady who asked her Irish servant if she really believed that the Irish could govern Ireland was properly rebuked by the reply: "Well, if the Irish can govern America, they can certainly govern Ireland!"

Internationals.

These are multiplying like rabbits. The irrepressible Sylvia Pankhurst, having quarrelled with the British Communist Party, is now helping the Fourth International, with headquarters in Berlin and numbering 80,000, it is said, in Germany; but is to have a British section. The cultivation of internationalism in Britain continues to be a favourite pastime in Germany, under influences which are certainly not directed to the increase of welfare in the British Empire. Continental teaching of Britons has gone so far, that in our Communist schools a "patriot" is described as "an *international blackleg*."

Mr. Lansbury's Clock

Is always a little fast. In February, 1918, he wrote in the *Herald*: "The Russian revolution has raised a sun in heaven which never can go out. It is shining in Germany, in England, in Austria, in Italy, in France. Not all the fogs of war can keep away its warmth. We, too, hold our hands to it. We warm our hopes at it. *It is the token that our hour comes.*" And again, "*The supreme hour has come.*"

Bombay Riot.

The disturbance during the Prince's visit was much more serious than appeared by the ordinary newspaper accounts in this country. The casualties reached four figures; and—as in the case of all disturbance of the "pathetic contentment of the people"—the forces let loose developed into racial conflicts, indicative of the glorious massacres to be expected when full "self-determination" is established.

The Cattle Embargo.

Sir A. Boscawen stands firm on this question. He said that of all the extraordinary remedies suggested for the amelioration of agricultural depression the most extraordinary was that of the removal of the Canadian cattle embargo. Nine out of ten agriculturalists in England and Wales, half the farmers of Scotland, and practically all the great pedigree breeders said that the removal of the embargo would strike a serious blow at the agriculture of Great Britain. But in respect to the importation of cattle from the Irish Free State, he added that the Government did not propose to take away from Ireland the privilege which that country had always enjoyed.

International Labour Office.

It is a pity that while the Geddes Committee was swinging the axe which has been so often mentioned, that their attention was not directed to the unnecessary and revolutionary activities of the International Labour Office, which is said to be costing us £400,000 per annum. It is one of the many inflictions the country is suffering from, due to the subservience of the Government to the leaders of the Labour Party. The stupendous conceit of men who, while claiming to speak and act for the silent mass of the workers of this country, are attempting to regulate conditions of labour in all countries, could only have grown up by the acceptance of their pretensions by our politicians and Press. This country has enough to do to re-establish the industries destroyed by the labour leaders, without reforming the rest of the world. This international farce, and the useless Labour Exchanges at home, ought to be wiped off our list of expenses.

BRITISH AGRICULTURE.

THE PLIGHT OF THE FARMER.

Mr. Murrough Wilson did good service to agriculture by moving his amendment to the Address, and referring to the urgent necessity for relieving agriculture of the disabilities which press unfairly on the industry, and which, combined with the depression from which it is suffering, threaten to reduce the food supplies of the country and to create further unemployment. He pointed out in his speech that there were two particular sets of circumstances which press unduly on agriculture at the present time: (1) World-wide causes, and (2) the recent action of Parliament in passing legislation which had afterwards to be cancelled. A few months ago the country was told that agriculture was to be put on so secure a basis that the food supplies of the nation would never again give ground for fear; and now the whole policy of the Government has been reversed. The idea of security for agriculture has been scrapped, and the Government has no intention of fulfilling its pledges. This has affected agriculture most disastrously; has destroyed credit, and produced chaos. No farmer knows where he stands or whether he will ever receive twenty shillings in the pound back from his harvest corn on his labour bill. The men who will suffer most are the moderate-size farmers and small holders. Many of these are ex-Service men who were induced to put their money in small holdings, and will now have to face ruin. What is most wanted in agriculture is confidence; but confidence has been absolutely destroyed by the shilly-shally action of the Government.

It is essential to advocate a forward policy in regard to agriculture, and THE PATRIOT will open its columns to a discussion as to what should be done to protect the greatest of our national industries. In the first place, it is necessary to consider what are the main causes which have produced the present state of affairs. Foreign competition is, of course, the main cause. With our huge industrial population—which is three times the normal population which Great Britain could at the present time feed with home produce—there is a tendency to ignore home productions, and to rely entirely on food supplied by the foreigner and our colonists across the seas. But, as we had to realise in the war, at any time there is a danger of these supplies being cut off. Should such a disaster happen, our population would be faced with absolute starvation. For the safety of the nation and as an insurance against so great a peril, it is absolutely essential that the land of the United Kingdom should be made to produce the largest possible amount for the food of the people. The danger of shortage of food has been greatly increased by what has happened in Ireland. Ninety-five per cent. of the trade of Ireland is with Great Britain, and the greatest proportion of the Irish exports (which amounted to two hundred million pounds last year) were food products—the Irish taking in return an equivalent amount of British manufactured goods. The revolution in Ireland has so dislocated agriculture in that country that the supply in future will be very greatly curtailed. This is a reason why it is more imperative than ever to develop British agriculture to the highest point of perfection.

Agriculture is hampered by the very high cost of transport. In many cases it costs more to convey an agricultural product from the British farmer to the British consumer than it does to convey the competing product from the foreign producer to the same consumer. Then there is a heavy taxation which falls entirely upon agriculture, as Captain Pretyman points out in his article in the *National Review* of this month. Direct taxation in other industries is passed on to the consumer, but this is not possible in agriculture, for the prices of agricultural products are fixed in relation to foreign importations. This heavy taxation, both Imperial and local, is one of the great causes of depression in agriculture and of unemployment in rural districts.

In the debate, Sir A. Boscawen, speaking for the Government, was very sympathetic, admitting the mistake which had been made in passing the Agriculture Act. He said that the soundest plan was for the Government to interfere with the industry as little as possible, and to leave it to work out its own salvation—"Let the farmer put his land to the best economic use." Now that is precisely what the farmer would wish for: but how can he relieve himself from the interference which has been established by taxation and competing transport rates which give a preference to foreign products? The Chancellor of the Exchequer has received an influential deputation from the Central Landowners' Association, the Scottish Landowners' Association, and the Land Union on matters concerning taxation, and, in reply to the deputation, has promised to give the fullest possible consideration to the questions raised before introducing his next Budget.

THE SOVIET CONFERENCE.

In last week's Supplement a quotation from Chicherin's secret instructions to his agents and diplomatic representatives abroad was given to show that the Soviet Government have been attempting to draw British and European diplomatists into a step which will result in "some stupid mistake," and that Mr. Lloyd George appears to be walking into the trap which is being laid at Genoa. As Soviet documents are seldom quoted in the newspapers, and this is particularly instructive, although not of recent date, it appears in full in this issue of THE PATRIOT. It explains much of the unrest which has upset the world during the last six months.

Trotsky's address in Moscow in connection with the formation of a new Red army Tank Brigade, and which appeared a few days ago in some papers, refers to the Genoa Conference in the following words:—

> Peace now prevails, but we know quite well that the present peace will not last long, that there can be no peace before the whole world belongs to the Red workmen and peasants. . . . They have now promised to recognise us at Genoa. The Western European bourgeoisie thinks when it invites us to a Conference only of our paying our debts, of our agreeing to make concessions, of our consenting to a dissolution of the Third Internationale. . . . Do not think that Western European diplomacy is in a brilliant position. Western diplomatists live in mutual enmity, like cats and dogs. At Genoa (I only whisper this to you, do not tell anybody) we shall exert all our efforts to set the cats and dogs on each other till the dust flies; and while they are fighting each other we shall know how to profit by it.

LORD LONG ON WORLD REVOLUTION.

In last week's Supplement to THE PATRIOT, the article by Lord Long was stated to have appeared in the *National Review*. This was incorrect and should have been *The Nineteenth Century* for this month.

WHAT DID ENGLAND DO?

Mr. Owen Wister, the American author, in his book "A Straight Deal, or the Ancient Grudge," pours out a stream of scorn on those yellow papers, ill-informed Americans, and intriguing Germans and Irishmen, who in the war, and since the war, continually asked the sneering question, "What did England do in the war, anyhow?" Mr. Wister mentions that this question asked by one man, in a group before a war bulletin board, was answered by another voice saying, "Her fleet's keeping the Kaiser out of your front yard, for one thing." The following extracts from one chapter are worth repeating in these days of forgetfulness, indifference, and poltroonery in national affairs:—

In May, 1918, England was sending men of fifty and boys of eighteen and a-half to the front; in August, 1918, every third male available between those years was fighting; eight and a-half million men for Army and Navy were raised by the British Empire, of which Ireland's share was two and three-tenths per cent., Wales' three and seven-tenths, Scotland's eight and three-tenths, and England's more than sixty per cent.; and this, taken proportionately to our greater population, would have amounted to thirteen million Americans. . . . Our casualties were 322,182. The casualties in the British Army were 3,049,971—a million more than we sent—and of these 658,704 were *killed*. Of her Navy 33,361 were killed, 6,405 wounded and missing: of her Merchant Marine, 14,661 were killed; a total of 48,000 killed—or ten per cent. of all in active service. Some of those of the Merchant Marine who escaped drowning through torpedoes and mines, went back to sea after being torpedoed five, six, and seven times. What did England do in the war, anyhow? Through four frightful years she fought with splendour, she suffered with splendour, she held on with splendour. The second battle of Ypres is but one drop in the sea of her epic courage; yet it would fill full a canto of a poem. . . . On the fourth day, with the Kaiser come to watch them crumble, three lines of Huns, wave after wave of Germany's picked troops, fell and broke upon this single line of British—and it held.

During 1917-1918 Britain's armies held the enemy in three continents and on six fronts. . . . Between March 21 and April 17, 1918, the Huns in their drive used 127 divisions, and of these 102 were concentrated against the British. . . . Britain shared also in the fighting in Russia, Kiaochau, New Guinea, Samoa, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Egypt, the Sudan, Cameroons, Togoland, East Africa, South-West Africa, Saloniki, Aden, Persia, and the N.W. frontier of India. Britain cleared 1,200,000 square miles of the enemy in German colonies. While fighting in Mesopotamia her soldiers were reconstructing at the same time. They reclaimed and cultivated more than 1,100 square miles of land there. In Palestine and Mesopntamia alone, British troops in 1917 took 23,590 prisoners. In 1918, in Palestine from September 18 to October 7 they took 79,000 prisoners.

With "French's contemptible little Army" she saved France at the start—but I'll skip that—except to mention that one division lost 10,000 out of 12,000 men, and 350 out of 400 officers. At Zeebruge and Ostend—do not forget the *Vindictive*—she dealt with submarines—but I'll skip that. I cannot set down all that she did, either at the start or nearing the finish, during those four years and three months that she was helping to hold Germany off from the throat of the world; it would make a very thick book. But I am giving you enough, I think, wherewith to answer the ignorant, and the frauds, and the fools. Tell them that from 1916 to 1918 Great Britain increased her tillage area by four million acres: wheat 39 per cent., barley 11, oats 35, potatoes 50—in spite of shortage of labour. She used wounded soldiers, college boys and girls, boy scouts, refugees, and she produced the biggest grain crop in *fifty years*. She started 1,400,000 new war gardens; most of those who worked them had worked already a long day in a munition factory. These devoted workers increased the potato crop in 1917 by three million tons—and thus released British provision ships to carry our soldiers across. . . . Of England's women—seven millions were engaged in work on munitions and other necessaries and apparatus of war. And who were these seven million women? The eldest daughter of a Duke and the daughter of a General won distinction in advanced munition work. . . . The mother of seven enlisted sons went into munitions not to be behind them in serving England. The stewardess of a torpedoed passenger ship was among the few survivors. Reaching land she got a job at a capstan lathe.

What did England do in the war, anyhow? On August 8, 1914, Lord Kitchener asked for 100,000 volunteers. He had them within fourteen days. In the first week of September 175,000 men enrolled. Eleven months later two million had enlisted. Ten months later 5,041,000 had voluntarily enrolled in the Army and Navy. In 1914 the Royal Naval Air Service had 64 aeroplanes and 800 airmen. In 1917 she had many thousand aeroplanes and 42,000 airmen. In her Royal Flying Corps she had in 1914, 66 planes and 100 men; in 1917 several thousand planes and men by tens of thousands. From July, 1917, to June, 1918, 4,102 enemy machines were destroyed or brought down with a loss of 1,213 machines.

Besides financing her own war coats, she had by October, 1917, loaned $800,000,000 to the Dominions, and $5,500,000,000 to the Allies. She raised five billion in thirty days.

The High Seas Fleet of Germany was bottled up. Five and a half million tons of German shipping and one million tons of Austrian shipping were driven off the seas or captured. Two million oversea Huns of fighting age were hindered from joining the enemy. In 1916, 2,100 mines were swept up, and 89 mine-sweepers lost. These mine-sweepers and patrol boats numbered 12 in 1914, and 3,300 by 1918. To patrol the seas British ships had to steam eight million miles in a single month. During the four years of the war they transported oversea more than 13,000,000 men (losing but 2,700 through enemy action) as well as transporting two million horses and mules, 500,000 vehicles, 25,000,000 tons of explosives, 51,000,000 tons of oil and fuel, 130,000,000 tons of food and other materials for the use of the Allies. In one month 355,000 men were carried from England to France.

Of the 5,000 anti-submarine craft operating day and night in the infested waters, we had 160, or 3 per cent. Of the 1,500,000 troops which went over from here in a few months Great Britain brought over two-thirds and escorted half. Admiral Sims said, "The British Grand Fleet is the foundation-stone of the cause of the whole of the Allies.

That is part of what England did in the war.

A STRAIGHT DEAL.

A Straight Deal, or the Ancient Grudge." By Owen Wister (Macmillan & Co., Ltd.)

This well-known American author set himself to explain the origin and unnecessary existence of misunderstandings with England, describing the primary one of false teaching of history to children, making England the natural enemy. Of individual stupidities on both sides he treats under the heading of "Rude Britannia, Crude Columbia"; and the Irish Home Rule question he calls "an international imposture" in a chapter most refreshing after the gush and misrepresentation to which the world has been long treated.

After a brief historical note of the early tribal chaos of Ireland and its relations with England, the writer gives home truths of modern doings.

The Irish nation is a legend, a myth, built by poetic imagination. During the centuries succeeding Henry the Second were many eras of violence and bloodshed . . . it is hard to say which side committed the most crimes. . . . Bloodshed and oppression existed everywhere in Europe. . . . Since the days of Gladstone England has steadily endeavoured to relieve Ireland, with the result that to-day she is oppressing Ireland rather less than our Federal Government is oppressing Massachusetts, or South Carolina, or any State. By the Wyndham Land Act of 1903 Ireland was placed in a position so advantageous, so utterly the reverse of oppression, that Dillon hastened to obstruct the operation of the Act, lest the Irish genius for grievance might perish from starvation. . . . Ask yourself this question: with Canada, Australia, and all those other colonies satisfied with England's rule, hastening to her assistance, and with only Ireland selling herself to Germany, is it not just possible that something is the matter with Ireland rather than with England? . . . Sinn Fein demands independence. . . . It is the unstable part of Ireland which has declared Ireland to be a Republic: I will call this part Green Ireland, and the thrifty, stable part as Orange Ireland. . . . It was the Orange Irish who fought in our struggle for independence, not the Green. . . . The Green Irish have made the ancient and honourable association of Tammany their own. Once it was American. It is a despotism built on corruption and fear. During our Civil War it was the Green Irish that resisted the draft in New York. They would not fight. You have heard of the draft riots in New York in 1862. They would not fight for the Confederacy either. . . . The Molly Maguires terrorised Pennsylvania by a reign of assassination till ringleaders were executed. They were Green Irish. . . . In Cork and Queenstown during the recent war our American sailors were assaulted and stoned by the Green Irish.

NOTES ON LABOUR.

NOTE.—Nothing which may appear in this column is dictated by antagonism to working men or to trade unions in their proper sphere of operation; but a continued exposure will be attempted of the Politicians, Theorists, and Revolutionaries who have during years of organisation and penetration corrupted the unions and misled their members, with the ultimate aim of establishing some kind of Socialistic State. "Labour" is now a Socialist political party, quite distinct from real labour.

THE LABOUR PARTY.—II.

With very few exceptions, all the moving spirits in the Labour Party have a disgraceful war record.

They were *Pacifists* at best—opposing every Act to increase our fighting forces, and encouraging our enemies, who quoted them continually in their newspapers as witnesses to the weakening of British spirit—but many were actual traitors, and everyone helped, directly or indirectly, in the encouragement of strikes and lessened output of munitions and coal. The damning list of strikes (*eighteen million days' work lost*) and the increasing absenteeism of workers as wages were forced up by threats to the Government, are sufficient evidence of how the deadly peril of the country was made use of by the Labour Party for securing their own political aims.

General Ludendorff put into writing (early in 1918) his clear recognition of the help given to Germany by Smillie; by the leaders of the railwaymen and dockers; and by the agitators among the machinists. All of the guilty parties—whether "Intellectuals," corrupted trade-union officials, or shop-steward Communists—*are still essential elements in the strength of the Labour Party*, and have unmistakable voices in its policy; though some of the voices are gagged occasionally (or disowned) when the "Moderates" take the limelight, for fear of awakening the public.

We have terribly short memories for injuries. If anyone will look back at events in 1917 and 1918 he will see daily occurrences of difficulties made by a few at home, added to the terrific strain on the Government from the war, and used to extort endless concessions for a privileged class; although the working-men and people generally were united and patriotic.

And the men with this record are still prominent as representing the honest working-men, whom they blinded and misled. And this "Labour" thinks it can rule this country.

In reading all comment and argument on the aims, the duties, or the conduct of Labour as an organised body, the general public are at a great disadvantage, and are always being bewildered or duped, because it is not realised that this organisation is made up of:—

(1) *The Socialists*—the so-called "Moderates" of the Party.

(2) *The Communists*—or "Extremists" of the Party.

(3) *Labour*—or the silent majority members of those trade unions which are politically run.

The individuals of the first two groups control the machinery of the politically run trade unions; they make use of their funds; and they all claim, in variously pitched voices, to speak for the great silent body, whose votes are the weapons shaken incessantly in the face of the Government and the public, to extort privileges for which the majority of the nation must pay, and to sway the policy of the country in its foreign relations.

There is no sharp line between the Socialist and Communist elements, for they merge into each other, and each has its right and left wing; but they all have one common object as a first move towards their various ultimate aims: that object is to cultivate class strife, so as to increase all discontent with a view to the destruction of industry under Capitalism.

The half-dozen or so of Labour leaders who are really patriotic and constitutional—and only Socialists by pressure—are of no actual power in the Party; and some are driven out of it in effect.

AMERICAN VIEW OF GENOA CONFERENCE.

The "Manufacturers' Record," of Baltimore, in an article headed "Shaking Hands with Assassins," publishes the following:—

"The British say the French have shaken hands with assassins in Asia Minor. The British and the French combine to shake hands with assassins further north. The pages of history are drenched with blood. The proscriptions of Sulla and Marius were presumed to have marked the high tide in human brutality. But where has there ever been written a record of such a shambles as Lenin and Trotsky created in Russia? It was bad enough that they should have robbed that great nation of its wealth, its industry, its food, and its chattels. But their deliberate policy was far more direct than that. It aimed at the destruction of intelligence. It was their purpose to destroy the brains of Russia. They organised murder as it was never organised before, butchering all who stood in their way or who might ever stand in their way, and the best blood of Russia they poured into the streets. Ability was made a crime, and possession was itself an indictment. In the whole catalogue of crime there can be found no words properly to describe the frightful orgies in which Trotsky and Lenin indulged. They are the master criminals of all times.

"They are now invited to participate on equal terms in a general economic conference to be held at Genoa. They are to be asked what ransoms they can pay for recognition by civilisation of the legality of their enterprise. Have they the wherewithal to wash themselves free of blood? That is the question, and the only question, that Paris and London are to ask them. If they can pay they will be pardoned. Not only pardoned, but welcomed with applause and made much of. Indeed, has not a United States senator declared that Lenin is one of the master intelligences of the age, perhaps the greatest of all men whom the recent tragedies of the human race have lifted to the platform? 'We are not ruled by murderers, but only by their friends.'

"The propagandists say that Lenin and Trotsky no longer are Communists; that they have learned the necessity of capitalism, so-called; that they are prepared to recognise the rights of property. Do the diplomats believe that the world's shudder of horror at Russian happenings was caused by the attack on property? Have we wept because a factory was seized, and has our blood run cold because banks in Russia ceased to be? There was grave menace to the world in the attempt to break down the property structure on which civilisation so laboriously had been built up, but the world's hatred of Lenin and Trotsky was not caused by their advocacy of an economic system, so-called."

"Never shall I think any country in Europe to be secure whilst there is established in the very centre of it a State (if so it may be called) founded on principles of anarchy, and which is in reality a college of armed fanatics, for the propagation of the principles of assassination, robbery, rebellion, fraud, faction, oppression, and impiety."—Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France."

FORGOTTEN THINGS.

EXTRACTED FROM A WAR-TIME SCRAP-BOOK.

April 26, 1916.

The newspapers full of stirring news. Rebellion in Dublin—described in the House of Commons the evening before; started by Sinn Feiners, who occupied Stephens Green and the Post Office; troops moved in from the Curragh; "the situation now well in hand."

The German battle-cruiser squadron bombarded Lowestoft; stayed twenty minutes; was engaged by our light cruisers and destroyers; hit two of them, but sank none. Two men, a woman, and a child killed on shore.

Zeppelins raided the East Coast districts; dropped about seventy bombs and seriously injured one man.

Sir Roger Casement brought to London from Ireland following his arrest in the abortive attempt to land arms from a German vessel. Bearing on his activities in Germany against England, Dr. Liebknecht's speech in the Reichstag quoted: "*I repeat I have documents showing an agreement has been concluded between the Under-Secretary Zimmerman and the English traitor Sir Robert Casement, by which English prisoners of war shall be trained in such places for military service against England.*"

The rebellion which was "well in hand" on April 26, continued for several days, and on May 1 the *Daily News* reported its suppression and explained how "to extract satisfaction from the lamentable affair" in these words:—

It has shown very strikingly the divorce of the wild movement from the general body of the Irish people. The outstanding fact of the whole episode is its isolation from the spirit of the nation. From first to last it may be doubted whether there were more than 3,000 people involved, with a large proportion of boys and youths. The sensational success of the rising brought no backing to the rebel flag, and the "Irish Republic" collapsed with the breath that proclaimed it. The whole population of Dublin was as much outraged as alarmed, and it is probable that the British soldier has never had such a cordial welcome in the Irish capital as during the past few days. . . . The Irish regiments have been more severe in their handling of the rebels than their English colleagues. . . . Their indignation that while they have been fighting the Germans for nearly two years, a little gang of traitors at home have been conspiring with their enemy is natural enough. . . These facts mark in a striking way the profound change that has come over the spirit of Ireland from that of the eighties. . . . It has revealed, as nothing else could reveal, the loyalty of the Irish people, and the happy change that a wiser policy and a larger liberty have brought in their train.

About May 16 official returns showed casualties to be:—Military and police—killed 124, wounded 397; civilians, killed 180, wounded 614; rebels executed 13, under death-sentence 2, penal servitude 84, hard labour 7, deported 1,706. Sixty-two cases of death sentence were commuted. Countess Markievicz received a life sentence; and others, three to twenty years. Mr. Asquith in Parliament said:—

As I say, it is not a question of numbers, and it is certainly not a question of revenge or reprisals—(hear, hear)—but when you think of the household—the English households—to which these gallant young men belong, who are bereaved, those to whom they looked forward, young men of promise, to whom the future belonged—when you think of these men in the prime of their youth cut off in the discharge, as I have said, of a thankless but of an urgent duty to their country, do not let our sympathies be entirely monopolised by the unfortunate, the misguided victims of this unhappy and criminal rebellion. (Cheers.) Let us observe some sense of proportion.

A LABOUR THREAT.

April 18, 1916.—Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., at a meeting of railwaymen in Southwark Park—when the necessity for compulsory military service was admitted by Mr. Asquith and the country generally—said:—

So far as the workers were concerned, the political truce was entered into with one object only—to unite the nation to bring the war to a successful conclusion. But to-day they found a deliberate attempt being made to break that truce—to foist on the workers of this country Conscription and Protection. If the political truce was to be broken in the interest of one set of politicians, if the unity of the nation was to be broken to satisfy certain individuals, then, as far as he was concerned, and, he believed, so far as the railwaymen of the country were concerned, they would say there was no further need of an industrial truce.

A GLOSSARY OF POLITICAL AND LABOUR TERMS.

No. 2.

As there is a demand for definition of many terms recently introduced in journalism, the following will be continued week by week.

C

C.L.C.—Central Labour College, has many branches and correspondence schools, and widely spreads the teaching of class hatred and Socialism. It is a secession from Ruskin College.

Class-war.—The movement of the many revolutionary associations to seize land, property, and money from the present possessors, so as to make a new use and distribution of wealth.

Class-consciousness.—A softened expression for class-hatred, and incitement to **Class-war.**

Collectivism.—The policy of State management of land and industry, as opposed to **Individualism**, or private freedom and open competition. Nationalisation is Collectivism.

Colour-bar.—A regulation in the African mining industry established by the trade-unions to prevent natives doing the more or less skilled work reserved for white labour.

Combing-out.—A term used during the war for taking a certain proportion of men out of industry for military service, who had previously been exempt from Conscription. The combing-out was applied to non-unionists or those who had joined the union during the war.

Commissars.—The small body of executive officers, largely Jews, of the Russian **Soviets.** Most of them are not native Russians: and practically none of them are working-men. They usurp all authority, and have been guilty of wholesale massacres, and the destruction of all industries, under Lenin and Trotsky.

Commodity Value of Labour.—A derisive term used by Socialists to describe the payment of labour in proportion to its results instead of paying men as men regardless of their effort.

Commune, The.—A temporary Government of 1871 in France, which proved the hopelessness and ghastly failure of any attempt by the State to find work for all, and to support those who would not work or could not be employed.

Communism.—Common control and ownership of everything; which when established is to result in "the ordered demand and supply of all those things essential to a happy human existence; all would have a new life with leisure, wealth, and freedom." In January, 1921, there was a fusion of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the British Section of the Third International, and the Communist Labour Party; and it was agreed to adopt the basis of the Moscow Statutes.

Compagnons de l'Intelligence.—Comrades of the Brain-workers; a French union of the middle classes to resist tyranny of either Labour or Capital.

C.O. (Conchie) (Conscientious Objector).—One who is assumed to have objections to fighting on religious grounds. Sometimes the objection does not apply to civil war.

Co-operative Commonwealth.—The future social order according to Communists. (See **Communism.**)

Coupon Candidate.—A candidate for election to Parliament who is indorsed and recommended to the electors by the caucus of the Government in power at the time.

C.P.I.—Communist Party of Ireland. Branch of the Communist International, with chief object of destruction of British Empire, and creation of Communist Republic in Ireland.

Craft-union.—A trade union based on actual craft—for instance, Boilermakers—as distinct from **Industry-union,** based on a whole industry, like **National Union of Railwaymen.**

C.W.C.—Clyde Workers' Committee.—A revolutionary body which promoted trouble and strikes during the war.

C.W.S.—The Co-operative Wholesale Society.

D

Defeatist.—One who was convinced that Germany could not be overcome, therefore peace should be offered to her on almost any terms. (See **Pacifist).**

D.O.R.A.—Defence of the Realm Act. A law giving exceptional powers to the Government for control of persons and property, as a war measure.

D.R.R.—Defence of the Realm Regulations.

Demagogue.—One who sways the people by promises incapable of fulfilment, or by appeals to passions, prejudices, or selfishness.

Democracy.—Any form of Government of a country which is under the ultimate control of the people as a whole: the people being the sovereign authority. The method of making that authority effective is usually by some system of voting to establish the will of the majority of the people; for a nation is hardly ever of one mind; and on many questions great numbers of the citizens have no opinion at all, and it is formed for them. (See **Oligarchy.**)

Deportation, Deportee.—Strikes on the Clyde in April, 1916, worked up in the munition factories and shipyards, by I.L.P. and other revolutionary bodies, led to arrest of ringleaders, and deporting of them from the district. Nine Shop-stewards were deported from Glasgow and not allowed to return till May, 1917.

Devolution.—The relief of Parliament by forming other legislative bodies in Great Britain to deal with local affairs not affecting national or Imperial policy.

(*To be continued.*)

SOVIET RUSSIA'S SECRET DIPLOMACY UNVEILED.

A protocol of great importance was addressed by the Russian Soviet Government "To the Directors of Diplomatic and Financial Affairs in the West and Representatives of the Russian Socialist Federation of Soviet Republics in England, Germany, Italy, and Tcheko-Slovakia." It bears the signature of Tchicherine, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, and Karahane, Director of the Western Department, and is dated February 6, 1921.

It commences with a review of the successes achieved against "World Imperialism" and "Capitalism" by the workers, and states that "the whole future of Soviet Russia depends on a skilful exploitation of the present general political situation of Europe," that while "systematic propaganda will some day bear fruit," something more is needed if victory is to be won in the near future, and there follow instructions for the carrying out of a co-ordinated plan of diplomacy intended to create confusion and dissension among the nations, thus producing national conflicts and the estrangement of the Entente Powers one from another, leading up to a world war.

We quote some striking passages from an authenticated copy of the original in our possession :—

The Versailles Treaty is even less than the scrap of paper the violation of which in 1914 has led to a world-conflict. If we were to analyse the inevitable political evolution of any European State, beginning from, say, the Anglo-American dissensions and finishing with the complicstions in the Balkans, we would see that in every State are ripening exterior complications which menace *with armed conflicts.*

The present order in Europe satisfies no one; indeed, it cannot satisfy any one, and all the time, with increasing potentiality, menaces with war. The bourgeois diplomacy will soon be absolutely unable to solve questions, always ripening and always put off. War alone can lead out of the hopeless situstion in which are at present all the lands of Western Europe. And whatever say sentimental assurances, all nations are unconsciously attracted towards war.

Our first problem is, therefore, not to let ourselves be led into this senseless conflict. Complications are bound to arise, and we must be in a position to utilise them for our purposes. But for this, on no side must we have our hands tied up.

The question remains just the same on whatever ground is to arise the conflict mentioned—whether on a Franco-German ground or upon any other, say an Anglo-American.

The profound organic motives underlying this last controversy (the Anglo-American one) can, of course, be very usefully utilised by us for our purposes. We are rapidly approaching the moment when, by the force of historic logic itself, *the capitalistic diplomatists will be inevitably (perhaps consciously) brought to make some stupidity, and all our efforts must be to encourage them to make the stupid mistake.* Germany requires moral support; we will give it. She wants security for her Western frontier; we will promise her this security. France desires to see our helplessness; we will show helplessness. England wishes to exploit us; we will give her full occasion to do so. It is necessary to transfer the centre of gravity from us to the West; let European diplomatists crack their heads over unsolvable problems. As to us, we will always have time to say our last word.

The first duty of our representatives is to strengthen themselves at their posts. We must make good use of time whilst we have it to prepare our ground. It is not advantageous to us to be feared and exaggerated; we ought to get forgotten.

The immediate aims for our representatives are, therefore, to get recognised to develop trade; to slowly spread propaganda; to enforce our authority and prestige among the proletariat masses.

Speaking on the subject of trade undertakings—far from me to pose unattainable problems. Everybody understands on what scales may be developed exchange of goods. But the political side of this question is much too important not to give to it the most careful attention. The present economical crisis in Europe may be slightly alleviated by a division of Russia into spheres of influences of the various powers of the West, and by giving them the possibility and occasion to exploit our natural riches and resources. Standing, as we do, on guard of the interests of workers and peasants, the Soviet Russia considers that it would be wrong, and a political mistake, to deprive the European Powers of the hope to be able to peacefully seize Russia.

Europe is beginning to endure a very acute period of decline in the values of goods. This explains the feverish attempts to obtain new markets. We must buoy up these hopes by giving them occasion to develop trade agreements. In the hope to seize a new market, the capitalists will throw large quantities of cheap goods into Russia. They will not succeed to seize the market, but meanwhile *we will make use of the cheap goods.* Some of the political leaders, perhaps, foresee all this; nevertheless, economic necessity *obliges them to conclude trade agreements.*

Anyhow, such trade agreements will have both material and political advantages for us.

Whilst following a policy of preparation and strengthening, our representatives must also make use of *every occasion arising on nationalistic soil for creating conflicts and contradictions.* In fact, discords must be created and augmented. From this point of view it is most desirable to give full attention to the relations between the Powers of the new Entente. If, perhaps, there may be some talk about the vitality of the Versailles Treaty, there can be no question about the Treaty of St. Germain: the relations of Hungary to her neighbour-Powers are such that they may be settled only in one way—by war. Such war is sure to affect Italy and to lead to a European conflagration.

The activity of our representatives must be directed to lose no occasion to envenom already existing *national dissensions.*

Nevertheless, to strengthen our position in the West, together with and in the hope that in case of war our affairs are sure to take a most favourable turn, is not enough; it is necessary to help and hasten on events by *adroit and intensive work of a most strenuous nature.*

At the present moment it is advantageous for us to gain time and prepare the ground. But we must discount that all such preparations are to be finished in the course of the next six months, and that after that it would be harmful for us to delay any longer. Experience has shown that when a certain maximum has been attained, it is never good to delay any longer. All preparatory work must be therefore carried on, remembering that all must be ready for the instant when the whole situation will become favourable. At that instant it will be necessary to begin decisive action.

After surveying the situation in the Balkans as a likely area for the commencement of hostilities, and describing how quarrels may be created between England and Italy over Greece, the manifesto concludes :—

Our representatives in England and Italy must more especially see to that. Thus spreading further and further East, further and further problems come within our grasp, leading more and more to divergences between the Powers, and this must always be discounted by our activities in London, in Paris, and in Rome.

The mutual interests of the Western Powers are at present so closely interwoven that it is impossible to predict what combinations and what alliances may arise. I draw the attention of our representatives to the following possible combinations :—The Anglo-Japanese *rapprochement* may serve as a menace to America; the Anglo-German *rapprochement* as a menace to France; the Italo-Greek *rapprochement* as a counterpoise to the policies of England and France in the Near East; the Franco-Polish *rapprochement* is a direct menace to Germany; the Tchecko-Roumanian *rapprochement* is a menace to Hungary; and so on.

Thus the activity of our representatives is to enter upon the wider arenas of world diplomacy. This will require certain changes in the sense of divisions into zones; whilst remaining autonome on the planes of party and technical work, our representatives will have to obey, in diplomatic questions, the instructions of the director of one of the three zones.

Only the strenuous work of all our representatives, and of all individual party workers, in conformity with the present instructions, may lead to the realisation of our aims.

The salvation of our Socialistic demands that we should attain the final destruction of those capitalo-imperialistic forces of Europe which are a constant menace to us. And only on the planes of diplomatic, or even, maybe, of nationalistic achievements, may we hope to assure and bring the victory of the Workers-Peasants Government.

(Signed) People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs,
TCHICHERINE.
(Countersigned) Director of the Western Department,
KARAHANE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, we take no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

THE EDITOR.

To the Editor.

Dear Sir,—I have received your copy of THE PATRIOT, and I think it my duty as a British subject to tell you my opinion of same. First, I must congratulate the writers on their articles, as it is a long time since I have heard anything like common-sense. It is the kind of paper we want during the coming election, when, I have no doubt, with the same policy and programme the Conservatives have, they will sweep the country. I regret very much, on account of the extremists and agitators inside the trade unions, who have brought on the trade depression, I am out of employment, and therefore cannot subscribe to your paper, but hope when the depression is over to be able to do so. Wishing you and your paper every success in the near future.—I am, yours faithfully,

Bethnal Green Rd., E.2, 11 Feb., 1922. H. D.

Sir,—The first number of THE PATRIOT is most instructive, and will, I feel sure, be of much benefit to those who need material to defeat the common enemy of our country—viz., the individual who seems to back on the principle "that whatever his own country does is invariably wrong and our enemies are the benefactors of the human race."—Yours faithfully,

Brighton, 13 Feb., 1922. T. E.

Dear Sir,—I gladly welcome THE PATRIOT as the real thing. It shows that there are a few wideawake people in these apathetic days, who may yet save the country and Empire, in spite of a dense, muddling Government. THE PATRIOT will, let us hope, act as a nurse for these incapables. I am sure that it will be able to resist the influences of our enemies. I hope that subscribers will be able to get all those who have the good of their country at heart to subscribe. Surely 7s. 6d. is not much to give in the interests of one's country. May I propose that all subscribers when they have finished with their copies present them to the public libraries. The apathy is deadly here. I think it is partly due to the climate. Of course, the Government and Press are chiefly to blame. Why are not Irishmen told the true reasons for all their troubles? I suppose the Labour leaders will wake up when the country is utterly ruined.

Torquay, 11 Feb., 1922. H. W. W.

Sir,—It was most gratifying to receive last week the first number of THE PATRIOT, which all Conservatives ought to support.

The most imperative need of the moment is the revival of the Conservative Party, whose policy must be based on sound principles and honesty of purpose. The country is sick to death of the Coalition and all its works, and would welcome the advent of almost any Government rather than the continuance of that invertebrate body. But there can be no question that, if Conservative opinion—which has lain dormant for so many years past—is systematically organised, and a leader chosen who is high-principled and possessed of moral courage, the Conservatives would sweep the country, and once again law, order, and peace would be assured.

It is the manifest duty of Conservatives, therefore, to shake off the shackles of Coalitionism without further delay, if the British Empire is to be saved from the weak and ruinous policy now being pursued by our present rulers.—Yours, etc.,

Wallington, 13 Feb., 1922. E. JAMES.

The following are extracts from a few of many very encouraging letters received immediately after the issue of No. 1 of THE PATRIOT:—

"I wish you would inform editors of THE PATRIOT how highly I appreciate the first number, received yesterday, and carefully read by me. I have already used my influence on friends to subscribe. A strong alliance of the several journals that are willing to print the *facts* of our present precarious existence as an Empire would probably serve to 'infect' others with the *antidote* to the revolutionary virus, and the rule of '*Sans Loy, Sans Foy, and Sans Roy.*'"

Royal Dorset Yacht Club, Weymouth.

"I was delighted to receive the first number of THE PATRIOT, and deeply appreciate its objects, believing that the information it contains is essential to all public workers at the present time."

Cricklewood, 12 Feb., 1922.

"I am greatly impressed with the sincerity and true patriotism of your rightly-named paper, THE PATRIOT. After reading it I am only too pleased to become a subscriber."

Tunbridge Wells.

"I am delighted with THE PATRIOT, and hope it will be universally read and be the means of awakening the people from their appalling apathy."

King's Worthy, Hampshire.

"I am obliged for the first copy of THE PATRIOT, and have read it through. I think that when the facts with which it deals become widely known, it will secure a large circulation. Several friends have thanked me for bringing the paper to their notice, and will procure copies through the ordinary channel."

Leeds, 11 Feb., 1922.

THE HAIR OF THE DOG THAT BIT US.

"Many people, indeed, are rather inclined to welcome the experiment of a Labour Government, on the simple ground that, in any case, whether for the worse or the better, it would be a change, and 'that would be something.' Against that weariness and fatalism I venture to oppose the view that here is a case in which the rule of *a fortiori* applies, and that if Governments carelessly drawn from the brain-working classes show no great competence in meeting the grave problems of our times, a Government drawn from the manual-working classes would be merely so much less competent to deal with issues that are certainly not too small for the greatest minds the political life of our country has ever furnished. . . . The failures of our existing Government are very largely explained by the extent to which it has actually paid deference to the Labour policies. . . . When, therefore, Labour pretends that its policy would save the country, the answer is that the country is in the greater need of being saved, precisely by the measure to which the political pressure of Labour, exerted upon a weak Government, has already partially realised Labour's aims. The notion that Labour's policy would save the country belongs, in short, to the 'hair of the dog that bit you' order of fallacy."

HAROLD OWEN in the *Yorkshire Post*, February 4.

UNDER PROTECTION OF THE I.R.A.

A lady writes from Ireland that when the British troops were withdrawn her house was raided by twenty men of the now powerful Communist Labour Party, and she had to escape through a window. The I.R.A., being informed, sent men to protect the house. This dependence on the I.R.A. is now becoming frequent, as a choice of evils since the people of Ireland have been deserted by England after being terrorised at the last election.

HELP IRISH LOYALISTS.

There is much distress among loyal citizens in Southern Ireland. Many have been forced to take refuge in England, where they are in great poverty.

Those who wish to help with money or employment are requested to communicate with the Secretary,

Southern Irish Loyalists Defence Fund,
25, Victoria Street,
London, S.W.1.

THE PATRIOT

No. 2.—Vol. 1. 16 FEBRUARY, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.

INCOME TAXPAYERS' SOCIETY

President - - - Rt. Hon. LORD INCHCAPE.
Hon. Director - Rt. Hon. LORD DECIES.

OBJECTS:

(1). To press for a reduction of the Income Tax as soon as the financial conditions of the Country permit.
(2). To press for redress of inequalities which specially affect the small Income Taxpayer.
(3). To maintain the constitutional principle of control of the administration, assessment and collection of Income Tax by the Taxpayers themselves through the medium of their representatives, the Commissioners for the General Purposes of the Income Tax and their local Officers.
(4). To simplify the machinery of assessment by protecting the Income Taxpayer against the duplication and complexity of forms.
(5). To watch suggested legislation and call attention to any proposed encroachments on the Taxpayers' liberties.
(6). To advise members on points of practice and to assist them generally.
(7). To investigate cases of hardship and seek redress by all lawful means.
(8). To seek to improve the incidence of Income Tax by advocating the abolition of anomalies.
(9). To assist in approved test cases where a principle is involved affecting groups of Income Taxpayers.

All Income Taxpayers in the Kingdom should support by becoming Members of the Society.

Annual minimum Subscription for Membership is—
Individuals - - 5s. 0d. | Firms, Companies and Corporations, £1 1s. 0d.

ADDRESS: **THE SECRETARY, Iddesleigh House, Caxton Street, Westminster, S.W.**

Passages Booked by all Steamers—Passports and Visas secured.

JERROME, DRUCE & Co., Ltd., Shipping and Insurance Agents, solicit inquiries relating to securing of berths, passports, and to shipping of goods to all parts of the world and all kinds of insurance.

ADDRESS: **Moorgate Hall, Moorgate, E.C. 2.**
Telephone—London Wall 1024.

SECRET HISTORY OF "THE INTERNATIONAL" WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Price 2/6.

Being a reprint of a book written in 1871 by the late Mr. William Hepworth Dixon, and containing many interesting and little-known facts about the activities of Karl Marx in the interest of Germany and against the interests of England and France.

Copies on application to

THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4. Telephone: CENTRAL 2109.

Published by The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.
Printed by St. Clements Press, Ltd., Portugal Street, Kingsway, W.C.2.